

PROTECTION AGAINST FREE TRADE
SPEECH OF
HON. WM. P. FRYE.

Dar.
HF1755
F948

UNIVERSITY
OF PITTSBURGH



LIBRARY

The Buhl Foundation

PROTECTION AGAINST FREE TRADE.

S P E E C H

OF

HON. WM. P. FRYE,

OF MAINE,

ON THE

PRESIDENT'S MESSAGE.

IN THE

SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,

JANUARY 23, 1888.



WASHINGTON.

1888.

Dar
HF1755
F948

Protection against Free Trade.

SPEECH

OF

HON. WILLIAM P. FRYE.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, having resumed the consideration of the motion to refer the President's annual message to the Committee on Finance—

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. If there be no further morning business, that order is closed.

Mr. FRYE. I move to take from the table the motion of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. SHERMAN] to refer the annual message of the President of the United States to the Committee on Finance.

The PRESIDENT *pro tempore*. The Senator from Maine moves that the Senate now proceed to the consideration of the motion of the Senator from Ohio, that the President's annual message be referred to the Committee on Finance.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate resumed the consideration of the motion to refer.

Mr. FRYE said:

Mr. PRESIDENT: The President of the United States, in his annual message, has thrown down the gauntlet of "free trade," with, I admit, a thin veneer of disguise—too thin, however, to deceive the people. His remarkable declaration of policy has, of course, been received in England with undisguised joy. She has been seeking our markets with a persistency that never tired, a courage that never failed, a faith never hopeless, though for a quarter of a century the defenses against her aggressions have been formidable, and now she hails with unconcealed delight the announcement that these defenses are to be razed. Listen to the comments of her press congratulating her people, and at the same time mercilessly stripping off the President's flimsy disguises:

[From the Saturday Review.]

It may be taken for granted that the President has not acted without previously consulting the leaders of the Democratic party and securing their approval. He and they have taken up again the old free-trade policy of the South Carolina politicians, unconnected with what, in the jargon of American politics, was called the sectional question.

[From The Spectator.]

His terse and telling message has struck a blow at American protection such as could never have been struck by any fair-trade league, such, indeed, as would have been greatly weakened by the operations of any fair-trade league * * * He has fired a shot at the protectionists which will be all the more effective for his refusal to discuss the theoretic issue. * * *

[From the People's Journal, Dundee.]

A great sensation has been created by President Cleveland's Message, and if the policy which it indicates be carried out, it will produce almost as much effect in this country as in America. The tariff reform which the President recommends goes as far, at least, as the abolition or reduction of the duties on raw materials. Should Congress give effect to this proposal, its immediate result would be an enormous stimulus to English industry.

[From the Scotsman.]

The President proposes a radical reduction in the duties on raw materials, or even their free importation, as a way of compensating manufacturers for the sacrifice which they are asked to make. The free importation of iron, coal, and wool would be a great boon to British producers; if it were accompanied with reductions in the tariff upon cotton, woolen, and other manufactures the artisans of this country would derive a marked benefit from it. If once the United States finds herself on the road to free trade she will hardly know where to stop, for the principle which President Cleveland, as the head of the Democratic party, lays down is really that no import duties are justifiable which are not levied solely for purposes of revenue.

[From the Glasgow Herald.]

"It is a condition which confronts us; not a theory." Precisely so. Words almost identical with these have been used, and with enormous effect, in this country by Adam Smith, by Richard Cobden, by Sir Robert Peel. President Cleveland may say to others, therefore, and think what he chooses, but he has precipitated the inevitable struggle between free trade and protection in the United States, and that is tantamount to saying that he is on the side of free trade.

[From the Haddingtonshire (Scotland) Courier.]

This much is certain, that another fierce contest is impending in America over the principle at issue. If it terminates, as it may be hoped it will do, in the direction of a relaxation of those imposts that now so vexatiously hamper commercial intercourse between Great Britain and the United States, we may look to an impetus being given to our home trade that will go far to make up for the depression of late years.

[The London Iron and Steel Trades Journal.]

The facts set forth in the President's message, though by no means new, are now brought so prominently under the notice of the American Congress and of American citizens that a violent stimulus must be given to the party which advocates entire freedom of trade.

[The London Iron.]

The message of President Cleveland to the United States Congress is the preliminary to a movement which, we trust, will gain in strength.

[The London Ironmonger.]

Dealing with the message as it stands, it would certainly seem to indicate a greater leaning towards free-trade principles on the part of the United States Cabinet than has been observable hitherto."

"Mr. Cleveland's policy," said the Times, "may not establish free trade in the strict sense of the term, but it will to a great extent make trade free."

"The President," said the Daily News, "does not seem to perceive the effect of his own arguments, or even the meaning of his own words. His statement that the question of free trade is irrelevant is astounding and preposterous. Mr. Cleveland has persuaded himself to think, or finds it convenient to say, that the principle of fostering native industries by duties on foreign imports can be made compatible with the principle of regulating the burdens upon the people by the needs of the public service. It is pure delusion. Protection, albeit indefensible, is the height of wisdom compared with proposals which combine all the evils of interference with all the risks of liberty."

"His real meaning is that the scheme by which the artificial fabric of domestic enterprise has been built up in America is fundamentally vicious. He demands in effect that there should be a tariff for revenue purposes only."

[From "A member of Parliament" by cable to the free-trade New York Herald.]

To convert the United States is indeed a triumph. The Cobden Club will henceforth set up a special shrine for the worship of President Cleveland, and send him all its publications gratis. Cobden founded free trade; Cleveland saved it. Such is the burden of the song all through England to-day.

[By special cable dispatch to the free-trade New York World.]

LONDON, December 10.

The English papers continue to devote much space to what they call "Mr. Cleveland's declaration in favor of free trade." From the average English comment the public here has been led to believe that free trade is now as good as adopted in the United States. It is considered here (in England) that free trade with us (in America) is just what is needed to revive drooping English industries. The Times, this morning, devotes a column to the American situation, denouncing Mr. Blaine for holding on to what it calls "the absurd principle of protection."

[From the London Post.]

We must regard the message of the President of the United States as being a distinct pronouncement in favor of free trade.

We shall be much mistaken if the effect of this State communication will not be to strengthen considerably the case of free traders in all parts of the world. It will be regarded as a step in the right direction by all who believe in the soundness of free-trade principles.

[From the London Times.]

It is calculated that to give effect to Mr. Cleveland's policy, duties to the amount of some £16,000,000 a year, about two-fifths of the entire customs revenue, must be surrendered. This operation may not establish "free trade" in the strict sense of the term, but it will to a great extent make trade free.

As was to be expected, the protectionists have taken the alarm, and, as our correspondent at Philadelphia informs us, they are organizing for a determined resistance. They are, no doubt, right in believing that, whatever may be said of preserving the essence of the protective system and of ignoring free trade, the tariff can not be reduced to the strict proportions of a revenue corresponding to the limited and diminishing necessities of the Federal Government without admitting a great flood of foreign competition.

[From the London Standard.]

"In readjusting the tariff," he adroitly explains, "the interests of American labor and our manufactures should be carefully considered. Relief from the hardships of the present tariff," he goes on to say, "should be devised with especial precaution against imperiling the existence of the manufacturing interests, but"—there is much virtue in the "but"—"such existence should not mean excessive profits."

Mr. Cleveland has used such praiseworthy candor in his positive treatment of the evils of the existing faulty system, that this soothing parenthesis, which the whole context proves to be a polite nothingness, may well be pardoned. When the inevitable consequences of adherence to a protectionist tariff are set forth by a man in Mr. Cleveland's position in the language which he has used, free trade becomes at once a living issue. There is an end of the truce, of the makeshifts, of the hollow compromises between the rival factions to keep the delicate subject in the background of the platform. If the Congress does not forthwith expunge the scandals of the customs lists the next Presidential campaign will be fought out, not on the obsolete cries of Republican and Democratic strife, but on the new question whether the people are—simply because it suits the convenience of certain manufacturing rings that foreign competition should be rigorously excluded—to be mulcted year after year of enormous sums which the Treasury does not need, and which it can not employ.

These exposures of the President's purpose, these expressions of redundant joy, these prophecies of the realization of long-deferred hopes, would have multiplied without limitation, if warning had not come that English opinions must be restrained in their utterance, or the full fruition of English hopes might be endangered. They heard the warning cry of the London Pall Mall Gazette:

English free-traders would be well advised if they moderated the ecstasy of their jubilation over President Cleveland's message. Every word which they say in its favor will be used as a powerful argument against the adoption of its recommendations.

They promptly gave heed, and these English free-traders assumed a new role, became congratulatory of America, complimentary of our statesmen, prophets "of a marvelous prosperity to visit our borders," seers with bright visions of our disenthralled Republic, "successfully com-

peting with their own country in the markets of the world." Is it possible that England has seen the shining of a light from heaven, and suddenly been converted into a great philanthropist? Has she come to recognize our country as "her daughter beyond the seas," entitled to her affectionate regard? Did she ever in all the history of her marvelous success permit the rights of any other nation to impede her progress in commerce or manufacturing? I admit freely her sagacity, her clear-sightedness, her promptness in action, her success in diplomacy, her power, but I deny emphatically that she ever before indicated any sympathy in our prosperity, and I assert with equal emphasis that she has never permitted an opportunity to injure us to pass unimproved.

I receive her congratulations now for all that they are worth in the light of her past conduct. But ought not these fresh and unwarned declarations of her press at least to put us on our guard? Ireland once supported in reasonable comfort 8,000,000 of people. Her manufacture of linen, silk, wool, and cotton, protected by tariffs, and encouraged by subsidies, absorbed her capital, employed her laborers, promoted a diversity of industries, and insured prosperity. England, was her next friend, advised, cajoled, and flattered her in to the belief that she could raise raw materials on her fertile soil, sell them to her, buy of her the manufactured products more cheaply than she could make them, and that free trade would be a national blessing. Beguiled by her, Ireland consented, her tariff was gradually repealed, horizontally destroyed, her subsidies withdrawn. Since then she has been raising raw material, selling it to England, buying her manufactured goods of her at prices determined by England alone, and to-day, with only 5,000,000 of people, is the poorest, most distracted and harassed country on earth. She drank the free-trade cup which England pressed to her lips to the very dregs. Thomas Francis Meagher, the Irish patriot, in a speech made at Dublin in 1847, thus summarized the results to his afflicted country of England's friendship and advice:

The cotton manufacture of Dublin, which employed 14,000 operatives, has been destroyed; the 3,000 silk looms of the Liberty have been destroyed; the stuff and serge manufactures, which employed 1,491 operatives, have been destroyed; the calico looms of Balbriggan have been destroyed; the flannel manufacture of Rotterdam has been destroyed; the blanket manufacture of Kilkenny has been destroyed; the camlet trade of Bandon, which produced £100,000 a year, has been destroyed; the worsted and stuff manufactures of Waterford have been destroyed; the ratoon and frieze manufactures of Carrick-on-Suir have been destroyed; one business alone survives, thrives, and flourishes, and dreads no bankruptcy. * * * That favored and privileged and patronized business is the Irish coffin-makers.

And yet, England hopes and the Democratic party expects that every Irish-American citizen of this Republic shall, in the coming Presidential election, vote for Mr. Cleveland and free trade!

Portugal, Egypt, India, China, and, indeed, our own country, in its early life, can bear abundant testimony to the blighting influences of England's peculiar policy. But all her victories in the past would pale into comparative insignificance in the presence of that she is now so confidently contemplating in the promise of Mr. Cleveland's message. One of the greatest of her free-trade writers and speakers declared, years ago, that her proudest achievement would be the subjugation of the American market, and that she thinks she beholds close at hand, accomplished, too, at a time for her the most fortunate possible.

She finds herself with her markets open to the world, whilst nearly all the nations of the earth have, partially at least, closed theirs to her. She sees her industries suffering from a competition under which some

of them can not long survive; her silk manufactures almost destroyed; whereonce in London alone there were 90,000 operatives, now only 8,000; Germany and Belgium capturing one-half of her colonial trade in iron and steel manufactures, competing successfully in her own home market to her loss of over \$800,000,000 in four years; James Adamson, president of the British Iron and Steel Association, in his inaugural address, delivered only a short time since, declaring that this industry would be driven to the wall without protection or a reduction of wages; her cotton industry crippled; the manufacturers of Manchester, in convention only a few months ago, declaring that lower wages or protection against Germany and Belgium must be had; millions of men and women seeking for work and finding none; thousands and tens of thousands of hungry men marching through the streets of London, even into that holy or holies, Westminster Abbey, with banners inscribed "bread or work;" nearly one-fifth of the population of London indoor paupers or requiring outdoor relief; her agricultural lands mortgaged for 58 per cent. of their worth, shrinking in value the last ten years more than one-half, and her farm laborers decreasing more than one-third, while those remaining work for from 1 shilling 6 pence to 2 shillings a day. In her distressed condition she hears the voice of President Cleveland proclaiming that "our present tariff laws," the very laws that partially close against her the best market in the world, are "the vicious, inequitable, and illogical source of unnecessary taxation," and who can wonder that her people should deafen our ears with their "hears! hears?"

She sees him adopt, as the slogan of the political battle of 1888, that fundamental doctrine of the free-trader of the past ages, exploded ten thousand times by cold facts, "the tariff raises the price to consumers of all articles imported and subject to duty, by precisely the sum paid for such duties," and why should they not indorse him as the great champion of their interests. She listens to his invitations to participate in the best market in the world, and knowing that such a participation would start her halting machinery, employ her millions of hungry, idle, laborers, why shouldn't they hail him as their great deliverer?

But, Mr. President, I come to a question more important to us here than England's attitude. Will the Democratic party indorse and sustain their chief? They have for a score or so of years been masquerading as reformers, in the garb of "tariff for revenue only with incidental protection," "of tariff for revenue exclusively," even in manufacturing sections as mild-mannered protectionists. In the South, where, until recently, there has been but little diversity in industries, they have been bolder in their utterances, but for the last few years, even there, blinded it may be by the smoke of iron furnaces, or bewildered by the noise of the loom and shuttle, now and then some bold man dares proclaim himself a friend of protection! But the Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST] a few days since, said, on the floor of the Senate, that he indorsed every line, word, and letter of the message, while the Senator from Indiana [Mr. VOORHEES] in his elaborate speech, in cold blood, laboring under no excitement, declared "it is true to the teachings and principles of the Democratic party, from its foundation, eighty-seven years ago, to the present day."

The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. HARRIS] in a speech made elsewhere, announced that his vote would never be given to the protection of any industry whatever. Indeed, I am inclined to the opinion that the party really believes "our tariff legislation to be vicious and illog-

ical," that a duty is a tax paid by the consumer. And why should it not? The controlling element of the Democratic party is in the South, and can to-day determine its principles as readily as it could before the rebellion, when it forced it into the championship of slavery. As to their position there can be little, if any, doubt. When they adopted a Constitution for the Confederacy, a portion of one article, agreed upon with entire unanimity, as I am informed, was in these words:

But no bounties shall be granted from the Treasury, nor shall any duties or taxes on importations from foreign nations be laid to promote or foster any branch of industry.

The Democratic Representatives of this part of our country learn and forget very slowly; and, in my opinion, the most of them still hold to that Confederate doctrine, and are totally blind to the marvelous changes wrought in their midst. For fifty years they have been inspiring the Democratic party to fidelity to the shibboleth of free trade, and whatever disguises the party may have adopted, however frequently it may have masqueraded before the public, however elastic it may have made its platforms, whenever it has been called upon to act it has fully justified the President's message as sound Democratic doctrine. In the Forty-fourth Congress they controlled the House, and have from then to now, except during the Forty-seventh, and for that entire time they have kept the whole country disturbed by their frantic efforts to revise the tariff, which has but one meaning in a Democratic dictionary—to reduce duties. Fernando Wood, William R. Morrison, and Randolph Tucker have been chairmen of the Committee on Ways and Means, all three of them open, undisguised free-traders. Mr. MILLS, of Texas, now presides over the deliberations of that committee—almost cranky in his advocacy of the same doctrine.

The Speaker of the House, Mr. CARLISLE, in his devotion to the work of destroying our present tariff, arrogated to himself almost despotic power in his refusal during the last Congress to recognize any member of the House to offer for immediate consideration any proposition to reduce the surplus unless it should first have been submitted to a Democratic caucus. At the opening of every Congress since and while they have had a majority in the House their war cry has been "Revise the tariff!" and every bill reported from their committee as a revision, if enacted into law, would have sacrificed many of our industries to the greed of Great Britain. They have even gone to the absurd extent of reporting favorably a horizontal reduction along the whole line of duties. The Democratic Secretary of the Treasury, too, helps to swell the choral song of free trade. In his annual report he says:

And now there is left only the revenue from customs taxation to be considered. Here is where the reduction should be made. * * * Add to the free-list as many articles as possible. Reduce duties upon every dutiable article to the lowest point possible.

In other words, strike down our "vicious" tariff. But the honorable Secretary does not rest here. He sees another direction in which we can legislate in the interests of Great Britain, and promptly seizes upon it. He says, in the same report:

A citizen of the United States may buy a foreign-built vessel in a foreign port; he may put the United States flag upon it and trade with all the countries of the world except his own. Our Government will protect him with all its power in such trade; but if he brings his ship with our flag upon it to one of our ports, our Government will confiscate it or impose prohibitory duties. He may, however, put the flag of any other country on that same ship and bring it to his home without molestation by our Government; it is then protected by the power

of a foreign country. It is difficult to understand why it would not be well to so change our navigation laws as to allow foreign-built ships owned by our citizens to come and go between this and other countries while bearing the flag of the country of their owners.

What the Secretary means in the first ten lines of this quotation is beyond my comprehension. I have always believed that the only way to determine the nationality of a vessel was by an examination of her papers, and it is an entirely novel doctrine that a flag settles the question. There is hardly a foreign steamship entering an American port that does not hoist the American flag. Nor was I aware before that a vessel could trade at any port of any commercial country without carrying such papers, regardless of the flag she was flying. The last four lines are unmistakable. The Secretary advises the prompt repeal of our laws which provide that no foreign-built vessel shall be admitted to an American register, also, of course, of all restrictions now protecting our coastwise trade. In other words, the Secretary accedes to the demands of Great Britain that she, with her cheap coal, iron, steel, and labor, shall build all of our ships. To be sure they are 90 per cent. labor; what of that? This Administration, from President down, prefers to employ, feed, and clothe English workmen to American. To be sure, such a surrender would destroy our coastwise fleet and trade; but what of that, the English and Canadians would serve our people more cheaply.

To be sure our ship-yards would disappear, our skilled ship-carpenters and mechanics forget their cunning, our sailors become unknown; but what of that, England could supply our necessities. To be sure a maritime nation without ships, ship-yards, and sailors might as well be without a constitution, would properly fall into contempt in the presence of the world; but what of that, our mother England has maritime power enough for the whole family, and will surely take care of her own.

Mr. President, it seems to me we may safely assume that the Democratic party, while it may not have the courage or the honesty of the President, does enjoy the same convictions as to the vicious, illogical, and inequitable character of our tariff laws; that, if by cheating the people as to their real sentiments, they can secure another lease of power, obtain control of the Senate, then we may bid farewell to any policy of protection illustrated in legislation.

Mr. President, the Republicans rejoice in the courage of the President, and take up his free-trade gauntlet.

They join the issue tendered and emphatically declare that our tariff laws, instead of being "vicious, inequitable, and illogical," are and have been promotive of a marvelous prosperity. That instead of "the duty increasing the tax to the purchaser" the effect of it has almost invariably been a reduction of cost to the consumer. Why, Mr. President, we live in a country wonderfully endowed, splendidly equipped for a successful struggle with any other. Our fertile lands can feed a billion of people as readily as they now sustain sixty millions. We have a seacoast almost limitless, within our borders one-half of all the fresh water in the world, located in lakes and rivers, as if our necessities and convenience had alone been consulted; as many miles of railroad as the rest of the world, and as a legitimate consequence, the lowest rates of freight to be found anywhere. We have inexhaustible mines of iron and coal in twenty-four of our States and Territories; even mountains of iron like Pilot Knob and Iron Mountain, said to contain 500,000,000 of tons of good quality, accessible. We have copper, lead, tin, gold, silver, granite, slate, lime-rock, marble, mountains of salt

and sulphur. Our capacity for wool-growing and for cotton-raising has never yet been tested. Texas alone can easily produce all the cotton we manufacture at home and export. We are possessed to-day of the finest machinery and the best tools, with a skill in their manufacture able to respond to all demands that may be made upon it. We have more inventive genius than any two of the nations of Europe. Our business men are energetic, bold, and sagacious, our laborers the best in the world, active, hopeful, and ambitious. With all these advantages we can not compete successfully with the countries of Europe. Why not? There is, there can be but one answer, we are handicapped by the cheap labor there.

Why, is labor a factor in production sufficient to overcome all of our advantages? Undoubtedly it is. Labor, on the average, makes one-half the cost of all production. I do not mean to assert that the cost of a yard of cheap cotton cloth is one-half labor, but iron ships, machinery, furnaces, forges, and factories are 90 per cent. labor. A year or two since I was in the Waltham Watch Factory. The superintendent showed me some watch screws so fine that the naked eye could not see the thread. I asked him to figure out their cost by the ton. He complied, and found it to be a little over \$4,600,000, seven times more precious than gold, and yet laying in the earth the ore was not worth more than one dollar and a half. Whether the labor converting the ore into the screw was one or two dollars a day would make a marvelous difference in its cost. But the free-trader insists that after all there is not much difference between the cost of labor here and in Europe; that the living is not so expensive there as here. Now, this is a question which must be settled according to the facts. It is fundamental, vital; and a mistake in its determination may be fatal to our industries.

During the year, the opportunity offering, I investigated as thoroughly as I could the condition of labor in Europe. My information was gathered largely from European investigators and from the men and women who worked. I found that to obtain it from the employers was difficult, and when obtained it was unreliable, wages being generally exaggerated. They were fond of dealing in averages. They arrived at these by disregarding numbers. For instance, in a cotton mill nearly all of the employés are women, a few skilled men being required to look after the machinery, to whom fair wages are paid. The superintendent in answer to your inquiry would reply, "We pay from \$2 a week to \$8, the average being \$4 or \$5." He never volunteered the information that while one hundred of his employés earned \$2 a week, only two were paid \$8. Our consuls are entitled to great credit for their unceasing efforts to arrive at the facts, but their sources of information have generally necessarily been the employers, and some of it I know has been incorrect. I visited personally factories, furnaces, forges, ship-yards, iron and coal mines, and talked whenever I could with the workmen, and in my conclusions as to facts do not think I can be mistaken.

ITALY.

Italy is not, I admit, a serious competitor of ours to-day, but, if I mistake not her spirit, means soon to be. She is not a power to be ignored in the great struggle of the nations for commercial and manufacturing supremacy. She has nearly 30,000,000 of people, an army of 500,000 men, a navy greatly superior to ours, powerful coast defense, supports and encourages her merchant marine by bounties and subsidies. King Humbert is one of the most sagacious rulers in all Europe, and

understanding thoroughly that to make his country prosperous and powerful the people must be employed, he is doing his utmost to encourage manufacturing enterprises, with a success, too, which is little known outside his own borders. During ten years the increase shipment of cotton from India to Italy has been 175 per cent., while that to England for the same period shows a decided decrease. What are the wages? In a government lace factory, employing hundreds of women and girls, making the finest thread laces in the world, the earnings were from 8 to 12 cents a day. One woman, who had worked there for forty years, the most skilled in the factory, succeeded in earning 12 cents a day, as I saw by the pay-roll of the mill. The superintendent of a cotton mill near Naples, employing mostly women, told me that they were excellent workmen, willing, contented, and cheerful; that their wages averaged 20 cents a day, while the men worked for 40. In a marble yard I found the earnings to be from 40 to 60 cents a day. Forty cents a day was regarded as good pay for an able bodied man. In the silk mills 20 cents for women and from 40 to 50 for men would secure all the laborers wanted. The farming was done almost entirely by women at from 16 to 20 cents a day. I never saw there any improved farm implements. Should they be furnished, four out of five of these women could be relieved from out door work and go into the mills. Indeed; there seems to be no end to the men and women willing to work for the lowest wages and yet with nothing to do. It is difficult to conceive of a progress in manufacturing which shall create in twenty years a demand for labor sufficient to increase to any great extent the wages.

BELGIUM.

Belgium is a competitor, and to England a most alarming one. It is a perfect bee-hive. The women make the land blossom like a rose at daily wages from 20 to 25 cents. In the lace factories at Brussels the skilled women, who in Italy were earning 12 cents a day, could command 20. In the cotton mills 25 cents a day was regarded as satisfactory wages for women, from 40 to 50 for men. In the iron and steel works \$4 a week would furnish an ample supply of common laborers, while skilled labor seldom averaged more than \$5 or \$6. Miners of iron and coal received from \$3.75 to \$4 a week.

GERMANY.

My conclusion was that the wages in Germany were hardly as high as in Belgium. Agricultural laborers seemed to be plenty at 20 cents a day, while women wood-sawyers in the streets of Munich were content with the same. I was told by a German statistician, an investigator of the labor problem, that the cotton-mills, employing mostly women, could hire them for anything they pleased to pay, and that some corporations without soul were taking advantage of this condition and paying wages "atrocious in their meagerness." To test the influence of their tariff on wages, a call was made upon 233 establishments, engineering, iron and steel, where, presumably, the highest wages are paid, for returns for the years 1879 and 1886. The responses show that the average wages paid before were about 15 shillings a week, and 16 shillings 6 pence in 1886, while the increase of workmen in these industries was 30,000. The supply of labor still exceeded the demand, and the rise had been small. I see that one of our consuls reports the average wages of women employed in the German factories to be \$2.38 a week. I am clearly of opinion that he is deceived, that he procured

these figures from the employers and not from the employed. I am entirely confident that one can employ all the women he requires at 25 cents a day to do any kind of work.

At Stuttgart, an important manufacturing point, there is an immense corset factory and the wages actually paid were not one-third of those in a like concern in the United States. The entire product was shipped to this country and invoiced at one-half of its market price. Hon. Charles P. Kimball, formerly Democratic candidate for governor of Maine, received the appointment from Mr. Cleveland to the consulship at this city. Three months after his arrival he wrote me: "I came here a free-trader; I am now a high protectionist. With present wages in America the attempt to compete with these Germans is absurd. Why the wages are a mere bagatelle. Our party should be looking to an increase rather than to a decrease in duties." I am quoting this letter from memory, but the substance is correctly given. Mr. Kimball paid a first-class coachman 2 marks (48 cents) a day and he boarded himself. From careful inquiries addressed to our consuls, to gentlemen investigating the labor problem, to employers and employed, I am entirely satisfied that the average annual earnings of able-bodied men in Germany will not exceed \$115, and of women \$85, while the agricultural laborers and the women employed in out-of-door work earn still less.

ENGLAND.

But England is the free-trader's paradise, and her scale of wages—higher than in any continental country, is cited as proof positive that a tariff is no protector of wage-workers, forgetting that this scale was largely influenced by the highest kind of protection, rigorously enforced by England until she believed that her wealth, her machinery, and her skilled workmen could control the markets of the world. Neither her manufacturers nor her laborers to-day participate in this admiration of her fiscal policy. Wages all over Great Britain are low and decreasing. Eighty thousand women are working in her cotton-mills at Manchester for from 30 to 35 cents a day, while the manufacturers are insisting upon a decrease, to enable them to compete with Germany and Belgium. Two shillings, and in favored localities, two and six-pence a day are the highest wages paid to common men laborers, while hundreds of thousands can not get work at that. I saw, on the magnificent docks at Liverpool, thousands of men, hungry-looking men, daily asking for work, work at any price, work if only an hour, so that they might buy bread for their children. The streets of the great cities are full of idle men, not willingly so, but from necessity, and great armies of police are required to preserve the peace. She is to-day supporting in her poor houses more than a million of people, and how many more receive outdoor relief no man can tell. Her silk industry is almost destroyed, her cotton is suffering, her iron and steel being supplanted by that of Germany and Belgium, her ship-building not employing one-half of the usual complement of men.

I heard Mr. Bradlaugh declare in a speech in Parliament that agriculture was ruined; that half of the farm laborers could get no work; that those employed received the pittance of a shilling or a shilling and sixpence a day. If I should describe the condition of English laborers in his words I should be charged with gross exaggeration. This being England's condition to-day, what utter nonsense to talk about high wages there. I say that men and women there will to-day work for

what they can get, and that the wages actually paid are not more than one-half of those paid in our Northern States.

SCOTLAND.

Scotland is in no better condition. In Glasgow, where Mr. Bright said forty-one thousand families out of every one hundred thousand lived each in one room, the army of the unemployed is perfectly immense, the evidences of pinching poverty horrible. The great works on and near that marvelous river, the Clyde, are painfully slack in business, ship-building greatly depressed, the most of the iron used, until recently mined and worked at home, is now imported from Spain, and wages are adjusted by the employers. While I was there all the ship-yards, furnaces, forges, and factories in and for 10 miles around the city shut down for an entire week on account of a two-days fair.

The Langloan iron works, located here, do an immense business, cover 35 acres of land, run seven furnaces, produce 300 tons of iron daily, consume in its production 500 tons of coal. The average haul of the coal is only 2 miles, and the cost delivered 5s. The average wages illustrate the highest paid labor. Skilled workmen are paid from 3s. to 7s. a day, the large majority not over 4s; their coal-miners from \$5.59 a week to \$5.88, iron-miners from \$5.34 to \$5.59 per hand, foremen from \$6.25 to \$6.32 a week, common laborers from 54 cents to 62 a day. I had a curiosity to visit Paisley, knowing that the enormous thread mills had their duplicates in our own country, at Newark and Pawtucket, run by the same owners. The hands employed there and here are nearly all women. The business is such as to require careful selection. The operatives were neat in appearance, active, attentive to their work, and satisfactory to their employers. Their earnings at the Paisley mills averaged about \$2.80 a week. A month or two since I was at Pawtucket; found the average weekly wages of the same class of workers, on precisely the same work and for the same owners, to be nearly \$8 a week. Mr. Coates, of the firm, told me that the help in Paisley were as active, efficient, and attended to as many machines or spindles as at Pawtucket. It is impossible to find a more reliable and faithful illustration of the difference in wages in Great Britain and America than this.

IRELAND.

It is hard for me to understand how any moderately decent rate of wages can prevail in this afflicted country. More than half of the people, men and women, seemed to be entirely out of work. As you ride through the country hundreds will follow your carriage, some of them for miles, begging for a penny. Agriculture seems practically dead. Out of the 250,000 tenants of small holdings, 5 acres and less, many, if not the most, formerly worked on the farms in England and Scotland during each summer, earning and saving enough to pay their rents, while their wives and children cared for the home lot. But now the farmers of England and Scotland cannot employ more than two-thirds of their own, so that resource is cut off. In some counties almost half of the inhabitants are now receiving help. Pauperism is fearfully increasing. They raise an abundance of wool, are willing to work for the lowest wages, and nearly all their mills are idle. What little cotton manufacturing they had seems to have disappeared, and even the linen industry has greatly declined. I hardly see how any rate of wages could be fixed.

They might depend upon the greed of the manufacturer and the

hunger of the worker. The very best of house servants could be obtained for \$1 a week. Flax breakers asked about \$4 a week, hacklers about the same, spinners and weavers \$2 to \$2.50. The women at work on the farms, I was told by good authority, were glad of 20 cents a day. Of the countries I visited, the wages in Switzerland and Italy were the lowest, Germany next, then Belgium, then France, while those in England were highest. Now, Mr. President, as to the cost of living. A conversation I had with an American consul will illustrate this. The consul had just concluded a report to the State Department with, "the cost of living for the laborer here is not half so great as in the United States." I called his attention to the statement, and asked him if beef was any cheaper there? No, was the reply. Pork? no; mutton? no; flour? no; butter? no; cheese? no; bacon? no. I asked him to name some necessary of life that was cheaper. He named clothing. I asked him if cotton underwear, such as they used, was cheaper than in America. He admitted it was not. I had already experimented in that, and discovered, by paying for it, that it was considerably higher. He, however, stood by woolen clothing. This I carefully investigated, and concluded the investigation in Boston on the day of my return. I have no hesitation in saying that our machine ready-made clothing, better made, more neatly fitted, can be purchased by the laborer here as cheaply as it can be in Great Britain. The consul finally said that I misunderstood the force of his report; that what he meant to be understood was that the laborer there did not expend for his living more than one-half as much as he did in the United States. This I readily admit, and am rejoiced that our workmen can expend twice as much. If, however, free-trade policy prevails, they will have an opportunity to compete in economy with the laborers abroad.

On the Continent almost everything consumed by workmen is fearfully taxed. It is estimated that in Italy 30 per cent. of the wages are required for taxes. In Russia, church and state take about one-half. In Germany, a Swiss porter without family, without a dollar of property, paid as his tax \$17 a year. I saw his receipt. But after all, the cost of living to the workman has no bearing at all on the question of our ability to compete. It is only significant as to the question, how shall he live when free trade has done its perfect work and his wages have been reduced to the European standard.

Now, Mr. President, this difference in the cost of labor has been becoming more vital every day. In my opinion 10 per cent. protection from 1830 to 1840 had as much efficiency as 40 per cent. now. Why? Fifty years ago the countries of the earth were widely apart, communication between them slow, uncertain, and dangerous, freights enormously high, the profits insisted upon by merchants and manufacturers excessive. Mr. Bright, in a speech in Parliament about that time, arguing that America as an independent country was a more valuable customer of England than she possibly could have been as her colony, said, "on all the goods exported to America during the last quarter of a century you have made a net profit of 40 per cent." These conditions and these circumstances alone afforded us great protection against their products, and effectually weakened the force of their competition. But now all these nations are touching elbows, the distances between are of little or no account; in time New York and Liverpool are no further apart than New York and San Francisco; in cost of freight not half so far; communication is regular, certain, constant.

The great interior cities have been brought close to the seaports by

railroads. In but a few days' time the bulk of any and all of the products of any one of the nations can be dumped onto the wharves of another. Excessive profits have disappeared. Whether or not there shall be any profit to the manufacturer at all depends upon his skill in organization, his economy in manufacturing, his immediate appropriation of every improvement in machinery—the largest possible production from any given amount of power. England, fifty years ago, with her advantage in machinery and skilled labor, had no fear of the competition of any country, however much cheaper its labor might be, while to-day she admits that Germany, and Belgium, and France are sorely pressing her. Now, Mr. President, confronted with the living facts of to-day, laying aside all fanciful theories, generally founded on error, can this Republic, with all her admitted advantages, compete with Great Britain and the nations of the Continent, even in her own markets, with labor abroad from one to two hundred per cent. cheaper than here? It can in only two ways:

First. By enacting into law the policy of protection; that is, nearly equalizing labor by a duty.

Second. By reducing the wages paid our laborers nearly to the level of European wages.

The first method, fortunately, is now no experiment. It has been on trial for a quarter of a century and its fruits are known. During that time, though for four years, millions of men were converted from producers to destroyers, though lives were sacrificed by the hundreds of thousands, though treasure was expended and property destroyed by the billions, yet we increased in population a million a year—more than England, France, Germany, and Austria combined in the same time. We increased in wealth from \$17,000,000,000 to \$43,000,000,000—a billion a year. Mulhall, the English statistician, no enthusiast in our favor, says that this Republic for a quarter of a century has laid up every year \$885,000,000—almost half as much as the saving of the whole world. Gladstone says: "England's daughter beyond the seas is passing by the mother at a canter," and she passed by her long ago—almost distanced her in the race. Mulhall gives the value of the annual product of Great Britain manufactures, mines and forestry, \$4,500,000,000, an increase since 1850 of 30 per cent. The same product in the United States, as appears by the census of 1880, was valued at \$5,500,000,000, an increase since 1860 of 160 per cent.

Since 1860 our farms have doubled in number, increased in value from \$6,000,000,000 to over \$10,000,000,000, while their product has increased from \$1,800,000,000 in 1860 to \$3,600,000,000 in 1880.

Mulhall gives the entire product of Great Britain, farms and all, in 1880, as worth \$6,200,000,000, \$172 to an inhabitant; her exportations same year \$1,300,000,000, leaving consumed at home \$136 worth to an inhabitant. The entire product of the United States for the same year was valued at \$10,000,000,000, \$200 to an inhabitant, and, more significant of prosperity than any other statement, \$9,176,000,000 of it were consumed at home. Our home market consumed more than Great Britain's home consumption and exportation combined. Our home market disposed of double in value the combined exports of Great Britain, France, Germany, Russia, Holland and Austria.

Great Britain has 20,000 miles of railroad, while we have 130,000, reaching 2,300 counties of our 44 States and Territories. We have grown weak in but one direction, our foreign carrying trade, which, during this period, has been absolutely without protection; but our

coastwise fleet has grown to magnificent proportions, three times as large as Great Britain's, five times greater than that of any other country. This has been protected by our navigation laws, and yet the honorable Secretary of the Treasury can see no reason why they should not be repealed. These results, Mr. President, are terrible blows to theoretical free trade, and yet, sir, we have not accomplished all that we ought the past year. The completed returns show that we imported last year, notwithstanding the "vicious" tariff:

Iron and steel and their manufactures	\$54, 618, 986
Wool and its manufactures.....	60, 586, 614
Flax, hemp and jute manufactures.....	33, 807, 283
Silk manufactures	31, 264, 277
Cotton manufactures.....	29, 500, 000
Total.....	209, 777, 160

The same returns show that the increased importations of these manufactures over that of 1886 amounted to nearly \$25,000,000; that the increase came when the duties had been slightly reduced. Now nearly all of these manufactures might just as well have been produced at home, two or three hundred thousand more of our people employed, a million more supported, a larger market insured. The most of these goods were those in the manufacturing of which labor was the most important element, its cheapness abroad enabling the foreign manufacturer to pay the duty and sell the goods in our market to the exclusion of ours. The duties on these products ought, in my opinion, to be increased; but is there a Democrat of all those frantic for the revision of the tariff who admits, even in his dreams, that any duty should be raised?

The second method by which competition is possible to us, the reduction of wages to the European standard, I do not care to discuss—a resort to it would destroy our industries, and imperil the very life of the Republic. It would degrade our laboring men and women, take from them all the stimulus of hope and ambition, reduce them to a condition worse than that of the foreign worker. They could not live as the European does, for they have known something better. Many things have become necessities to them and to their families which are luxuries elsewhere. And yet free trade would inevitably work out this result.

Mr. President, what is this tariff which so provokes the hostility of the Democratic party; so arouses the warm indignation of the President, and leads him to such vigorous denunciation?

They say, first, that it is a cunning device of the Republican party to care for capital; to protect bloated manufacturers; to build up monopolies; to make the rich richer and the poor poorer, and the President appeals to the patriotism of these greedy manufacturers to surrender some of their ill-gotten gains. Why, sir, how utterly absurd. The capital, the money of this country needs no especial protection. It is amply able to care for itself. If invested it finds its business unprofitable, it can readily change its investment; if located at one point it gains no adequate returns, it can easily locate at another; it may even, as it does occasionally, leave the country and build up an industry in another; it may avoid all business enterprise, invest itself in United States bonds, where it is perfectly safe and pays no taxes, or in State, county, town, and railroad bonds, or it may deposit itself in national or savings banks. But, Mr. President, capital is excessively timid. A tariff encourages it to locate itself here at home, to come out from

banks and bonds, go into factories of wool, cotton, and silk, into machine shops, into furnaces and forges, into an active development of the vast resources of this country, thus creating and sustaining a constantly increasing demand for labor, which inevitably results in advancing wages for the workman. The tariff does its beneficent work of protection where protection most is needed. It guards the laborer here against the competition of the cheap wages of Europe.

Without it as a safeguard, when times were hard, when European countries had, as they do every now and then, enormous surpluses of manufactured products piled up at home, our markets would be flooded, our factories closed, our laborers out of work, or if business continued wages would necessarily suffer a serious reduction.

Again: Suppose we had free trade, manufacturing in this country would not cease. Iron, steel, cotton, wool, and silk would still be worked by busy hands, but the hearts of the workers would no longer be buoyant with hope, their homes no longer comfortable and happy. They must work and weep, or starve. Then, indeed, might monopoly become possible, and capital despotic, for the cheaper the wages, the more likelihood of the ownership of the worker.

Mr. President, where are the enormous profits of the manufacturer the President asks them to yield in part? That such were realized, both at home and abroad, years ago, I admit, but that day has gone forever. Competition is so fierce that the margin for gain is exceedingly small. I am personally familiar with the operations of manufacturers of fabrics, indeed, live in a city devoted to the business, and I assert, without fear of contradiction, that the manufacturers of New England of cotton, wool, and silk have not for the last five years averaged a net profit of over 6 per cent. I assert further that a guaranty to them of such a profit for the next ten years would be eminently satisfactory.

But, says the President, the tariff raises the prices to consumers by precisely the sums paid for such duties, or in other words, a duty is a tax paid by the purchaser, and yet he may examine the entire list of the industries of this country, encouraged and sustained by the protective tariff, and not one can be found justifying his proposition, except sugar, and that only because up to now, for climatic reasons, competition has not done its perfect work. I assert the very contrary, that even "the present vicious, iniquitable, and illogical" tariff laws have decreased to the consumer the prices of all the products of protected industries, other than sugar, by more than 25 per cent. since they have been in force, and if I had time could bring forward to its support hundreds of unimpeachable witnesses.

Under the encouragement of our tariff, that is a duty of about 58 per cent., the manufacture of glass has increased enormously in this country, employing thousands of men at good wages, and yet you can buy a foot of plate glass to-day for \$1 which cost \$2.50 in 1860.

In 1860 salt was free; the price at Chicago was \$2 a barrel. In 1861 a duty of 6 cents a hundred was laid—later on 24 cents a hundred—and in 1880 it was selling in Chicago for 75 cents a barrel, and now in Michigan for 60 cents.

WORSTED CLOTHS.

In 1860 there were 3 mills in the country, wages low, business poor, production small. We encouraged it with a heavy duty, and in 1883 we were running 5,000 looms, employing 75,000 workmen, consuming 50,000,000 pounds of wool, producing 15,000,000 yards annually, with

a capital of \$20,000,000. During this time worsted cloths declined in price from 35 to 40 per cent. In 1883 the duty was reduced; by a vicious construction of the law a greater reduction still was made; now one-third of our looms are idle. In 1883 we imported a little less than \$500,000 worth of these goods, last year nearly \$5,000,000. If the President succeeds in inducing Congress to still further reduce, all of our mills will close, we shall once more import all we need from England, and the prices will go back to those of 1860.

POTTERY.

In 1860 pottery carried a revenue duty of 24 per cent. The business was insignificant, the wages low; only two or three thousand people employed. The Morrill tariff act levied a duty of 40 per cent., subsequently increased to 55, and to-day we make pottery in every State in the Union, except Florida, employ an immense force of help, pay wages higher than in 1860, and yet as much can be bought now for \$2.50 as could be then for \$4.

COTTON GOODS.

The duty on some of the cheaper lines of cotton goods is nearly as great as the price of the fabric, and yet they were never furnished to the people as cheaply as now. They are retailing in my city at a lower price than in Manchester, England.

SILK.

Silk manufacture in this country is almost entirely due to the Morrill tariff act, which laid a duty of over 50 cent. In 1860 only 4,000 workmen were engaged in the business. To-day 40,000 men and women are employed; capital invested, \$17,000,000; annual pay-roll, \$9,000,000; product valued at \$50,000,000. In New Jersey alone in 1886 the production of the silk looms was worth \$28,000,000, employed 20,000 people, paying them annually nearly \$7,000,000.

How about the prices? I give the decline as shown by the price lists of 1865 and 1882:

	Per cent.
Machine twist.....	56
Fine silks and scarfs	55
Serges and twilled silks.....	62
Handkerchiefs.....	62
Ribbons.....	54
Laces.....	50
Dress goods.....	30 to 35

Take soda-ash. We use it in enormous quantities in the manufacture of glass, soap, and for bleaching purposes. Six years ago we imported all we used and paid \$48 a ton. A duty was laid on it of one-quarter cent a pound. Six hundred thousand dollars of English capital was induced to come to Syracuse, unite with an equal amount there, erect an immense factory, which I had the pleasure of visiting a short time since. The product of the mill was 150 tons daily, requiring for its production 300 tons of lime rock, 300 tons of salt, 300 tons of coal, and 5 tons of ammonia; all, while in the earth, of little value, 90 per cent. of the worth of the manufactured product being labor. This concern employs directly 750 men; wages average \$1.75 a day, while the English wages in the same business average a little less than a dollar. How about the price? During the first quarter of their operations in 1884 the price fell to \$45 a ton; the second quarter to \$36, while in the last invoice I saw, only a month or two since, it was a shade less

than \$30. But why pursue this further? Ten thousand such witnesses might be summoned and testify as clearly and convincingly as these, and then the free-trader, with the President of the United States, championing his cause, would still insist that a duty was a tax paid by the consumer. Well, Mr. President, why is it not, and how does a protective tariff decrease the price to consumers?

The worsted manufacture will illustrate it. We were purchasing all of our goods in England; there the price was determined, not here. Of course the highest possible was fixed. We imposed a heavy duty on the cloths, and for a brief period prices strengthened, but encouraged by this protection capital emerged from the banks, bonds were converted into money, worsted mills were built all over the North until \$20,000,000 were invested. Then we established the market price, not England. Competition at home became a powerful factor in its determination. The mills were thoroughly reorganized, economy became a science, the inventive genius of the country was called upon for new and improved machinery; it responded generously, as it always does here, the product was doubled with the same power, and the prices continually fell, while the wages of the operatives increased.

Now, Mr. President, suppose this Administration succeeds in destroying this industry, what will be the inevitable result?

Home competition will disappear, we shall no longer regulate the market; what cloths we need we shall buy abroad. England once more determines the conditions on which we shall buy, and the prices will go back. If, however, all of our industries were equally exposed to the pernicious effects of free trade, they might not be destroyed. Manufacturing might, and probably would, continue here, but the price of it would have to be paid by the poor laborer, in scanty wages, hard work, poor living, and destroyed homes. The total extinguishment of one industry is easy, for its laborers would not consent to a reduction of wages which would enable it to live, but would find employment in those that survived. The doctrine of the President, that the wages of those employed in the protected industries alone are affected is too absurd to require refutation.

But, Mr. President, there is a surplus. What shall be done with that? I object to the surplus just as vehemently as does the President. We need nothing more, and ought to have nothing more than a working surplus. Democratic incapacity has afflicted us with this evil, and if we are not careful the same incapacity, in providing a remedy for the disease, will, by mistake, administer poison to the patient. The disposition of this surplus does not seem to me a very serious problem. Some of it ought to be wisely expended in the restoration of our merchant marine, in the building of a navy, in the erection of necessary coast and harbor fortifications, in the education of the people. But if the only thing desirable is to stop the inflow of money, that can be easily effected. Not, however, by the method proposed by the President, and indorsed by his Secretary of the Treasury.

A readjustment or revision of the tariff can be depended upon to reduce revenues only by two methods, one by extending the free-list, the other by an increase of duties and the consequent discouragement of importations. The latter would provoke the hostility of every free-trader in the country, while the former would cripple or destroy many of our industries. There is no middle course, for any reduction of duty less than a repeal only tends to invite increased importation, and to insure a greater revenue. The annual report of the Secretary of the Treasury

shows this clearly. By reference to it we find a small decrease of duty on wool, manufactures of wool, of iron, steel, and silk, while the increase revenue in 1887 over 1886 from these articles alone was \$10,908,460. Knit goods fairly illustrate this position. By the act of 1883 the duty was reduced 10 per cent., now about 15. During the years 1881, 1882, and 1883, under the old tariff, we imported 1,318,807 pounds, and collected as duty \$1,722,483.

For the years 1884, 1885, and 1886, under the reduced duties, we imported 3,433,480 pounds, an increase of 2,114,573 pounds, and there was paid into the Treasury \$3,617,864, an increase in the revenue from this source of \$1,894,881. Worsted cloths afford another illustration. The act of 1883 made a slight reduction on the wool and on the cloth, but an unjust classification resulted in a reduction on the cloths of, I should think, from 15 to 20 per cent. What followed? The year before this act took effect our importations of these cloths amounted to a little less than \$500,000. Then an increase commenced which resulted, last year, in an importation of nearly \$5,000,000, a decrease of duty of 20 per cent., an increase of revenue of 500 per cent. The same result followed the reduction on yarns, on dolmans, cloaks, and other outside garments, on raw, combed, clothing, carpet wools, and shoddy.

Now, suppose Congress, in response to the message of the President, reduces the tariff along the whole line 20 or 30 per cent. Is not an increase of revenue inevitable? Then, surely, our industries would have been crippled for nothing, our laborers sacrificed without compensation, our market surrendered without pay.

But if the earnest purpose is to stop the inflow of money into the Treasury, then as the Senator from Georgia [Mr. BROWN] proposes, we can repeal all of the internal-revenue taxes, and it is accomplished. The Democrats and their allies, the brewers and saloon-keepers, need not worry so about the temperance sentiment of the country. That is very rapidly crystallizing into the opinion that the tax on spirits ought to be repealed, in the best interests of temperance. One of my objections to this proposition is that it would keep from the Treasury too much money, that an exigency might arise, as in 1875, requiring the reimposition of these taxes, always a difficult thing to do.

We can repeal the tobacco tax and \$30,000,000 will stay in the pockets of the people. Repeal the tax on all spirits used in the mechanic arts and in manufactures—ten millions more are provided against. If in the list of dutiable articles any can be found the importation of which will not compete with a successful production of the like at home, place them on the free-list. It seems to me that sugar clearly comes within this specification. It has been highly protected for many years, carries to-day the heaviest tax of any article necessary for consumption, 78 per cent. ad valorem, and yet while its use has steadily increased its production in this country has not increased at all in thirty years. It is the only protected article illustrating the fidelity to truth of the President's free-trade doctrine, that a duty is a tax paid by the consumer.

We were in need of money in 1875, and the Secretary of the Treasury sent to the House of Representatives a statement as to the condition of the finances and a request that new taxation should be levied somewhere; and where did we levy it? We put a duty of 25 per cent. on sugar, because we knew we could get money from sugar in the quickest and the most certain way to meet the exigency of the Treasury. The title of the act is "An act to provide for the exigencies of the Government," and that duty of 25 per cent. is still on sugar. Where is the exigency?

The President of the United States declares that the Treasury is so plethoric that it is a standing menace to the Republic itself, and yet that duty of 25 per cent. still remains.

Mr. President, I would repeal the duty on sugar. I tried my best in 1883 when the tariff was under revision in the Senate of the United States to get that 25 per cent. off, and then 40 per cent. off, and nearly every Democrat in the Senate voted against my amendments. I asked the Senator from Texas [Mr. COKE], I remember perfectly well, to inform me or the Senate why it was that he, a free-trader, voted against every amendment to reduce the duty on sugar, and he replied frankly that it was because it was a duty for revenue only.

Mr. President, I say I am in favor of taking the duty off sugar and giving it to the people cheap. It is in fact the only duty paid by the consumer, is paid, too, by every family in the country—the only one that fails to encourage home production, and in my opinion ought to be repealed. But I would not destroy this industry, feeble as it is, nor would I discourage the present attempts to make sugar from beets or sorghum.

In the repealing act I would provide for a direct bounty on every pound of sugar produced in this country equivalent to the duty now levied. I would make further provision that this repeal should not apply to the sugar product of any country laying an export duty, nor to sugar brought into our ports in any vessels other than those of the country exporting or our own, nor to such exportation from countries refusing to our ships in their ports precisely the same treatment in light-house dues and other charges as we grant to theirs in our ports, or making less favorable terms for the entry of any of our products than are made by it to the goods of other countries.

This repeal would probably reduce our revenues next year \$60,000,000, and the bounties paid would amount to seven millions more. A further reduction would not be safe, for "exigencies" are liable to confront us, as they did in 1875.

If this should be regarded as too radical, resulting in too great a decrease of revenue, we could reduce the duty on sugar one-half, and then it would bear the highest rate imposed on any article of food, except rice. If, however, the only purpose is to destroy the protective principle in the tariff, then, of course, the President and his Secretary of the Treasury have submitted to Congress a plan absolutely certain of success.

Mr. President, we have a splendid country, perfectly marvelous in its possibilities. It ought to lead the world in a lofty, pure civilization, in religion, education, temperance, in the arts, sciences, literature, and in material progress. Who of us doubts its glorious future, if only we remember that we are Americans; if only our administration of affairs, and our legislation shall be earnestly directed to the promotion of the best interests of our people, [Applause in the galleries.]





